

Selected Articles from *The Individual* April 1997

Since 2002, each new issue of the SIF's journal, *The Individual*, has been uploaded onto the SIF's website at www.individualist.org.uk as a PDF file. Before that, online availability was very limited.

To remedy this, we have reconstructed back-issues of the journal using only the core articles. We hope that you will find them of interest. Any comments should be directed to the current editor of *The Individual* at editor@individualist.org.uk.

Please note that views expressed herein are not necessarily those of the SIF but are printed as a contribution to debate.

Title	Page
<i>Why & How We Should Leave the European Union</i> - Fabian Ollins	2
<i>Free Speech and Race Relations</i> - Derek Turner	3
<i>Toys And Safety</i> - Peter R. Curry	5
<i>The Last Gun Battle?</i> - Anon.	6
Review of Steve Ludlum & Martin Smith's <i>Contemporary British Conservatism</i> - Martin Ball	6

WHY & HOW WE SHOULD LEAVE THE EUROPEAN UNION

Fabian Ollins

In 1975, in common with a majority of my fellow citizens, I voted to remain within the EEC. For me, the EEC was the real thing and EFTA, of which until 1979 we had been a member, was very much second-best. Despite background rumblings, I did not hesitate in making my decision, regarding it as axiomatic that no British government would lead the nation to self-destruction. We had joined the Common Market because it was in our best economic interests and would to continue as members for the same reason. This, in fact, is the principal argument advanced by the pro-Europeans today.

It was not until the mid-eighties that I became aware of the increasing role and malign influence of "Europe" in our affairs. Total disillusion set in following the passage of the Single European Act, for it was this which enabled the European Commission and European Court of Justice to pursue, in the guise of "harmonisation", the objective of the European political elite. At that time this was not at all obvious and even now, despite clear statement by many of our "partners", our own political leaders persist in denying that the objective is a federal Europe. Regardless of theological arguments about the meaning of the term "federalism", the fact is that national independence is incompatible with membership of a federal state. The seat of power is the federal capital, which, in the case of the European Union, is Brussels. Put simply, Britain enjoys less autonomy in some respects than the individual states in the USA.

As if that were not bad enough, a problem peculiar to the EU is its form of government. Effectively it is a *nomenklatura*. By design it is immune to the influence of any electorate, being corporate in structure and organisation. Isolated from the electorate, the ruling caste is free to pursue its utopian vision of a perfect, ordered world and to attempt its realisation, by imposing its collectivist ideology through the channels of its institutions. In addition, an obsession with current politically correct fetishes such as the environment, health and safety, food hygiene, sexual equality, etc., has resulted in an explosion of regulations embodying unworkable solutions to non-existent problems. For the British who, unlike their partners, have a respect for the law, an unfortunate side-effect is the ferocious zealotry with which officialdom has seized upon, enlarged, and expanded this avalanche of legislation, the latest example being the proposed implementation of the 48-hour-working-week directive. Its cost in economic and social terms has been incalculable and its side-effects have in many cases been truly bizarre. A further disaster from the British point of view has been the encroachment of a cultural ethos which directly conflicts with, and is inimical to, the Anglo-Saxon traditions and practices which this country has evolved over centuries and which it has successfully exported to the US and the old dominions. Almost as an afterthought one can cite the rampant profligacy, inefficiency, incompetence, and corruption which characterises the entire enterprise.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the EU resembles nothing so much as the old Soviet Union. This is true not only of its institutional arrogance, incompetence and corruption; even its language and terms of expression mimic those of the Soviet Union. It will almost certainly end up equally bankrupt.

It is no coincidence that those most favourably disposed to the European Union are the progressive elite whose belief in the perfectibility of the human race through institutional means remains unaffected by past failure. They are the fellow travellers of the nineties for whom the EU affords the opportunity to indulge their insatiable appetite for control.

I am filled with rage and despair at the betrayal of the British people by its defeatist and pusillanimous Brahmin caste which has given away by stealth and mendacity that which was not theirs to give. My anger is also directed towards the self-styled guardians of the public conscience, the media, who have, with a few noble exceptions, loftily denigrated and sneered at those struggling to arrest the process. I fear the consequences of the backlash which this Bourbonesque disdain for the plebs will ultimately provoke. Already there are rumblings in Austria and France. I do not want to see this country consumed in the firestorm which will engulf Europe when the EU falls apart.

It is not too late for Britain's withdrawal and the opportunity should be taken while it is available. Fortunately there is a political party which offers this prospect. To those readers of *The Individual* equally concerned, my advice is to cast their votes for the UK Independence Party candidate standing in their constituency.

Following the catastrophe of the Maastricht debates, the party came into existence to provide the electorate with an alternative to the political hegemony which offered no choice on "Europe". Thus its commitment is to withdrawal from the EU. In addition it is committed to ensure that never again will it be possible for the British people to have their rights stolen from them. From a handful of members it has grown to a nationwide organisation which intends to field a candidate in every constituency. The UK Independence Party has a full programme covering the issues on which the major parties indulge their shadow play. Unlike those parties, however, it has no ideological inheritance to compromise its approach, nor is it in thrall to interest groups. It is free to examine every issue on its merits. Thus it is neither "left" nor "right", luxuries to which Britain, in its hour of crisis, cannot afford. Its objective is to restore to Britain its freedom to take its own decisions and to create a climate in which its citizens can exercise free choice.

FREE SPEECH AND RACE RELATIONS

Derek Turner

The following is the text of a talk delivered to the Society on 4th December 1996. Mr Turner is Editor of Right NOW!

"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly, as when they discuss it freely" said Lord Macaulay. This aphorism may sound glaringly obvious to the intelligent and rational people in this room, but all first principles need to be restated in times of confusion. The simple, practical rules of life — such as that no-one can understand, let alone resolve, a problem until it has been described honestly — are no longer taken for granted. To those of us here, it will seem abundantly clear that when one is making any decision about any problem that exists, or may exist, one should assemble one's facts properly, try to fit them together into a coherent pattern, describe them as clearly as possible and then prescribe on the basis of this clearest possible understanding. Even if one believed that there was no objective reality, one should at least allow the various subjective impressions, prejudices and value-systems to battle it out freely among themselves, with each separate influence being both counted and weighed. This is the scientific, empirical, Western method — this is how civilized men and women have always behaved, or at least tried to behave.

But we are not all civilized, and even the most urbane of us are not always civilized. Man is much more often an animal than he is a rational animal. A million multifarious influences, many unconscious and unrecognized, twist our judgements. We may be unwilling to face facts, or even unable to face facts, because they conflict in some way with ideas we hold dear — because our parents thought a certain way — because we dislike or distrust the individuals who ask inconvenient questions, or bring uncomfortable facts to light — because we fear the possible consequences if certain things were to become better known. One must accept that freedom of speech can never be absolute — or that it could only ever be absolute for a very short period of time, which would be followed by anarchy. There will always have to be some kind of orthodoxy, which can never be surpassed, only replaced by another more agreeable to ourselves.

There must always be taboos, intellectual no-go (or rarely-go) areas. In any long-established society, a sort of discreet silence falls across certain dark corners of the corporate life. Those who seek to break the silence and lift the gloom are regarded as insensitive, impertinent interlopers, or even as infidels. In the most advanced societies, such out-of-bounds areas are few in number and relatively insignificant, and the only form of censorship that operates is self-censorship, whereby researchers are restrained more by their sense of propriety than by any sense of fear. These congenial societies are aided by common assumptions, which come from having a self-assured majority culture, a shared religion or a sense of national identity, or all of the above at once. This kind of society can normally find gentlemanly and relaxed ways of dealing with the occasional incursion from the Badlands of Knowledge — while elsewhere, censorship is all too often brutally enforced at three

o'clock in the morning by secret police kicking in your door. Although we in the West were lucky enough to escape living under Communism, it is nevertheless a depressing fact that massive censorship and harsh repression of academic inquiry unseen since the Middle Ages are now becoming an accepted part of life in Western societies. This censorship is of two kinds — the first a self-censorship so subtle in its operation, so habitual, and practised by so many diverse people that it cannot be regarded as a programme, but rather as a phenomenon. Where it differs from the type of self-censorship previously described is that it is not restraint based on good manners, but a restraint based on prudence — or fear of the consequences. For coupled with this self-censorship is a much more worrying active censorship, perpetrated by people who call themselves "liberals", but who are really illiberal in the extreme. This censorship is going on all the time, especially in the media and in universities, and not in respect of some arcane field of science, but in relation to the vast and vitally important topic of race relations, which encompasses the three main sub-headings of racial genetic differences, immigration and multiculturalism.

The fleeting comparison between repression in the Marxist countries and repression here is not an entirely idle one. Marxist ideology is founded on the quasi-religious doctrines of human equality and internationalism — exactly the same principles which motivate "politically correct" opinion in liberal democracies. It is not coincidental that influential anthropologists and sociologists like Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, Trofim Lysenko and the modern Leon Kamin all held, or hold, views far to the Left of New Labour. Conservatism depended for much of its historical legitimacy on the hereditarian argument, which has been the prevailing wisdom of the Western world for most of its history. "What is born of a hen will scrape" runs an Italian proverb. "Breed is stronger than pasture" George Eliot reminded us. "I am always environed by myself" said Emerson.

This century, the hereditarians were finally defeated by the proponents of the environmentalist argument, who held that only create a level playing field, only move people from slums into new houses, only grant everyone equal rights, only teach everyone in the same way and a golden age of equality and peace would ensue. This belief, supported by post-Christian evangelist fervour and also now by the forces of inanition, still rules today, although it has been weakened by the grudging admission — borne of overwhelming evidence — that genes and heredity do have a part to play in sociology. Although it has had to concede partial defeat on this front, the environmentalist Establishment is fighting to retain its position of dominance, like any in-group threatened by obstreperous rebels. For the moment, sociobiology still has to shelter behind the euphemism of "evolutionary psychology". Dire consequences may still be visited upon anyone who has the temerity to speak out about race relations in any way other than the hushed and reverential tones favoured by the political Left.

Those who even partly agree with Disraeli's dictum, that "No man will treat with indifference the principle of race" must perforce remain silent or expect to be at the receiving end of some rather nasty treatment.

Take the most recent case, that of University of Edinburgh psychology lecturer Chris Brand. Respected academic publisher, John Wiley and Son, was about to release his book, *The "g" Factor*, a scholarly examination of the implications of general intelligence. At a pre-launch press conference, Brand, an enthusiastic, articulate man, was grilled by angst-filled reporters about the section of the book that dealt with black-white intelligence differences, which Brand, in common with many other academics, believes are genetically determined. One of the journalists asked Brand whether he was a "racist", to which he received the humorous but shocking reply that if he was going to be called a racist anyway, then he would like to be called a "scientific racist". The reply was plastered across the media (particularly in Scotland), some of the students and staff held outraged meetings calling for his dismissal, and Wiley forgot their earlier enthusiasm for the book and issued a hasty press statement, saying that they found it "repellent". They refused to proceed with the book, in an apparent breach of contract, and offered Brand money to go away quietly with the copyright and all the un-jacketed copies of his book. This he has so far refused to do. He is still trying to find another large publisher and, until recently, has kept the worldwide academic community informed through his Internet and e-mail sites. I say "until recently", because the University have just shut off his e-mail and Internet access, and suspended him from teaching and administration. This is a new, subtle form of censorship, where nobody desires to be called a "censor", but under which inconvenient people will simply not get their books published at all.

This is not the first controversial work that Wiley has been too scared to print. In July 1996, after ten months, they finally declined to publish an 800-page work on the same subject by Arthur Jensen, author of the shattering 1969 *Harvard Educational Review* article called "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Wiley's American Manager of Corporate Communications finally admitted that the rejection of Jensen's book was a "very deliberate decision" and that Wiley does "not want to publish in this field" — a strange position, surely, for an ostensibly academic publisher to take.

One could multiply examples of other academics who have experienced difficulties in the post-war years because of their anti-egalitarian beliefs. I shall name just a few, each of them traduced as "fascists" and often physically attacked — Professor Michael Levin, City College of New York; William Shockley, co-inventor of the transistor; Charles Spearman, progenitor of the theory of general intelligence; Sir Cyril Burt, twin studies pioneer; Charles Murray and Richard Herrnstein, joint authors of *The Bell Curve*, the ground-breaking study of intelligence in the United States; Richard Lynn, formerly professor of psychology at the University of Ulster; Linda Gottfredson at the University of Delaware; Hans-Jurgen Eysenck, professor emeritus of psychology at the University of London, attacked by Maoist idealists at the LSE in 1973; Thomas Bouchard, head of the famous Minnesota Twin Study. The accusations of "fascism" are even more preposterous than usual in the cases of Hans Eysenck, who was a political

refugee from Hitler's Germany and Michael Levin and (the deceased) Richard Herrnstein, both Jewish. In another case, that of Englishman Jean-Phillippe Rushton, professor of psychology at the University of Western Ontario, it grew particularly nasty, as detailed in his recent article in *Right Now*. After reading out a paper at the 1989 meeting at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the premier of Ontario called for Rushton's dismissal, the Attorney General's office carried out a six-month investigation as to whether he had contravened "hate laws", the Ontario Human Rights Commission carried out a four-year investigation as to whether he had "poisoned the learning environment", and he was compelled to teach classes by videotape.

But it is not only in this area of academic study that there is bias and censorship. The other aspects of race relations labour under much the same disabilities. As with the scientific debate, there is a prevailing "correct" view, with which it is perilous to disagree. Most people self-censor themselves so as not to breach the taboo. As a result, debate has been stifled in every Western country, with the foreseeable result that Right-wing individuals and parties are surfacing and growing everywhere (although not yet in the UK), voicing at last the muttered complaints of the normal people who must bear the brunt of all the social experimentation, and who are often very angry at what they see as the invasion by large numbers of immigrants of their neighbourhoods and the denigration of their culture by multiculturalist ideologues.

There is a whole mythology which underlies the liberal position, and there are many different pressures tending towards a multiculturalist "end of history". Racism only runs one way; that is, only whites can be racists, although there was some muted criticism of Diane Abbott's recent comments about "blonde, blue-eyed" Finnish nurses. Blacks can only be victims; this is why so many were willing to believe the recent story about black churches being bombed by white racists in the American South, and why they are so willing to believe in hoaxers like Tawana Bradley, who pretended that she had been gang-raped by members of the Ku Klux Klan, and was sympathetically quizzed by outraged liberals, some of whom consequently called for all Right-wing organisations to be banned. Bradley later admitted the whole thing had been a hoax, when confronted with pictures taken by the FBI of herself painting swastikas on her own front door.

The professional anti-racists have made common cause with other minority groups who are, or believe themselves to be, disadvantaged by society, particularly feminists, Greens and the stateless nationalists, such as those on the UK's Celtic fringe — attack one, and you attack them all. There is a common belief that immigration brings "cultural enrichment" — although the whites did not culturally enrich the Indians or the Africans. "Liberals" in love with all nations but their own, like Polly Toynbee, who recently advocated allowing all 3.3 million Hong Kong Chinese into "boring, bland Britain", and even some libertarians, in love with the individual only, regard Western ethnicity as something laughable, or even as an atavistic threat to the money-making activities which are the sole unifying force in multicultural, polytheistic societies. A certain type of Christian believes it a moral duty to break down all barriers and enforce equality in preparation for a Technicolored heaven, where lions will lie down with lambs and Swedes

with Hottentots. At the last General Synod, the Archdeacon of Lancaster asked for "help" for those parishes "where there are few black faces to be seen". For the Left, fighting against discrimination by whites is likewise a moral crusade, worth any sacrifice of majority freedoms — which, in any case, they believe to be a "construct" designed to oppress minority groups. "Nineteenth century concepts of freedom of expression [are] behind us ... formulations that worked for the white male dominated society of the past are failing us in the future" wrote two respected American academics recently.

The conservative Right has traditionally been much too quiet about race relations and immigration. If conserving the character of your country should not be a conservative preoccupation, then what should be? Most conservatives did not dare to touch on the topic, or thought for their own managerial reasons that there was simply no point in stirring up a hornet's nest. As a result of this, it was left to fringe groups to enunciate the widespread distrust of multiracialism, with the result that opposition to multiracialism became connected in the public mind with skinheads and unpleasant behaviour. Although there was an Enoch Powell, and there was much private disgruntlement among conservatives like Churchill and Keith Joseph, most Conservatives were too far removed from Stepney, Moss Side and Toxteth to see what was happening. It is only very recently that politicians like Winston Churchill, Jr and Ann Widdecombe have begun to take an interest in race, and that is only because they can no longer simply ignore it. For example, even the instinctively liberal Michael Howard had to do something when presented with alarming statistics on black street crime in London by Sir Paul Condon. The metamorphosis of the old Conservative Party into a party of classical liberalism is one of the most significant — and unfortunate — developments of recent decades.

It has been left up to a courageous and honest few to break through the barrier — like Bradford headmaster Ray Honeyford, whose concern was with the dearth of proper Christian education in an increasingly Islamic school system, and former civil servant Robert Henderson, who wrote a closely argued article in *Wisden Cricket Monthly* suggesting that foreign (not necessarily non-white) players playing for England's cricket team might not have as much innate commitment to the cause of England as would a team of native-born Englishmen, thus voicing something of widespread concern within professional sports circles. As with the academics listed above, all these individuals suffered media harassment and censorship for their pains. In Robert Henderson's case, he was unable to get a single word published in self-defence in any of the media that attacked him, which included the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Guardian* and the BBC.

The Left will certainly keep up pressure to defeat and suppress the resurgent Right, with its unsettling message of individualism, inequality, and identity. There is too much at stake for them. The postwar ideal, of liberal, internationalist, socialistic, non-judgemental democracies, depends for its moral legitimacy and thus existence on the concepts of human equality and human interchangeability. This is why multiracialism and multiculturalism must be enforced by central government, rather than allowed to develop or not to develop naturally. This slightly cosy arrangement must be broken up, so that commonsense and conservatism may triumph again, and the essential individual be allowed to retain his identity, which is at least partly defined by his ethnicity. The Left's double standards must be exposed, the censorship dragged out into the open, and the "liberals" revealed for what they are. As Goethe said, "None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free".

TOYS AND SAFETY

Peter R. Curry

I have an interesting toy (I prefer to call it a toy) in the form of a model beetle that appears to be alive when one opens the lid of its box. I was exasperated when I discovered one of those fussy safety notices, so often encountered nowadays, stuck on the bottom of the box. It said: "WARNING. This is a novelty item not a toy and not suitable for children under 15 years of age because of small parts. Please keep details for further reference." Are we now required by law to treat all who are unfortunate enough to be under 15 as complete morons, not to be trusted with anything that can be imagined to be the slightest bit dangerous? If so, it is not surprising that so many of them are turning delinquent.

I was dismantling and attempting to reassemble clockwork toys before I was five. I sometimes got my fingers trapped or cut, but do not doubt that it did me less harm than the frustration of those exploratory urges might have done. When children find that everything they want to do, good or bad, is forbidden on some pretext or other, they get desperate. Tragically, many of the toys we enjoyed playing with when we were

young are stupidly banned.

At one time, making toys, usually for bazaars and similar events, gave me great pleasure; but I understand that nowadays, all toys, even when made as a hobby, must conform to certain regulations, so many of them, in fact, that one would risk breaking the law at every turn if one were to make toys without consulting a rule book. It seems that, just because a few obviously dangerous toys (such as soft toys with spikes inside) once appeared on the market, they had to push the legislative boat out, resulting in maximum harassment for toy manufacturers, and the virtual outlawing of the making of toys for pleasure — things that good legislators should avoid like the plague!

I used to make kaleidoscopes, and enjoyed saving empty kitchen rolls for reinforcing with newspaper, a picture-framing friend used to give me glass off-cuts that could be frosted where necessary using a method described in an old *Boys Own Annual*, and I found a way or ironing out chocolate and bis-

cuit packing etc. to produce transparent plastic chips of various colours. The job provided the satisfaction of converting stuff that would normally be thrown away into worthwhile objects that could give pleasure. Nowadays one could get into trouble for doing it because it is not considered lawful to encourage children to play with glass. The kaleidoscopes would have to be labelled as not suitable for children, or something ridiculous like that.

In an old edition of *The Children's Encyclopaedia* there is an article (meant for children), on making kaleidoscopes using real glass. Those were the days! Evidently children were trusted with glass then, and given credit for having some common sense. Any danger involved was probably more than justified by the pleasure and instruction such activity afforded. Nowadays we are so obsessed with safety that other considerations do not get a look in. We need a Society for the Suppression of Safety! It is fast becoming the world's worst tyrant!

THE LAST GUN BATTLE?

An SIF Report

The government and other gun-grabbers did not have it all their own way during the discussions on the Firearms (Amendment) Bill in the House of Lords. For example:

Lord Monson: The prizes — assuming that the Select Committee were to find for Lord Cullen, so to speak — would be enormous all round. Tens of thousands of law-abiding men and women would be able to continue practising their sport and their clubs would not go bankrupt in consequence of extremely expensive security precautions which would otherwise be necessary. Tens of thousands of natural Conservative supporters would return to the fold. Tens of millions of pounds of taxpayers' money could be better spent elsewhere and, above all, the general public would be much safer in that a dismantled gun has almost no value to a thief ...

Lord Braybrooke: ... This is vexatious legislation. Many Members of your Lordships' Committee and my fellow Lord Lieutenants have received large numbers of letters. In my case not one of them was in favour of the legislation. Many people have written against it and I received one letter this morning which said that no amount of legal circumnavigation around the sizes of barrels and so forth will alter the situation one

whit.

The means of stopping killings is to control illegally held handguns. My informant told me that 2,000 such guns are imported every week and that there are around 2 million in circulation in the country. This legislation banning a specific form of gun, sadly, will not affect the situation one iota. I have full sympathy with Dunblane. I had a daughter who was killed on the roads in 1980 while riding her horse. It is terribly distressing. But we do not then assume that cars or horses are to blame. It is not guns that are to blame; it is the people who use them.

Lord Monson: I wonder why the noble Lord, Lord McIntosh, has so little faith in his fellow countrymen and countrywomen. Almost every other civilised country in the world has more liberal gun laws than the Government propose, and far, far more liberal gun laws than the Opposition propose, and yet their inhabitants seem perfectly happy and safe, and indeed they are statistically safe. I see no sign of British tourists avoiding those countries where, in the majority of them, guns are more freely available.

REVIEW OF STEVE LUDLUM & MARTIN SMITH'S *CONTEMPORARY BRITISH CONSERVATISM*

Martin Ball

MacMillan Press, 1996, 322 pp, £13.99 pb, ISBN 0-333-62949-3.

This book comes out of the same Sheffield University politics department as did the True Blues survey of Conservative Party grassroots members' views. It concentrates on assessing events after 1975 and in particular the impact of the Thatcher years on John Major's premiership. The key question addressed is the extent to which the Thatcherite inheritance has been protected or diluted by a return to a more consensual Conservatism.

The issues which interest the co-editors are: whether the Thatcher revolution has survived the sacking of its leader, and whether Major has been able to develop a distinct programme of his own? More pressing for Conservative party members they ask — "What state is the party in?" They consider the varying assessments of the Thatcher inheritance: that Major is constrained by the Thatcher agenda; or that Major has re-jigged the Conservative philosophy to meet the circumstances of the present day; or that Thatcher was not the radical she is made-up to be and that Major is following her example of governing by conservative statecraft.

The various chapters inform us that: the average age of party members is 62 years; Thatcherism effected a "substantial ideological shift"; the Parliamentary party remains socially exclusive; the MPs' rebellion over Maastricht was widely supported, if not followed; New Right thinking influences the structure of government; "selective interventionism" has been hidden by the rhetoric of a free-market approach to policy; and, the "heroic" promise to roll back the state has been replaced by "the more mellow promise of greater choice". In their concluding chapter Ludlam and Smith present a powerful analysis of contemporary British conservatism. The situation is so bad that by the mid-1990s: "The basis of its electoral triumphs was visibly weakening, its membership and funding were falling alarmingly, and its reputation for unity in defence of the British state lay in tatters as it divided from top to bottom over Europe and national sovereignty".

So how has the Thatcher legacy been dealt with by Major? They suggest that in being constrained by the economic and political inheritance, Majorism's political change is "more style than substance". Although, the remarkable thing about his premiership, they go on to argue, is that: "... it has been precisely in those areas where Thatcherism was incomplete that Major has remained most faithful to the Thatcher project". Further: "Major's direction has been one of implementing Thatcherism rather than challenging its key precepts. In policy

after policy area, Major has maintained the Thatcherite agenda."

Their final remarks of all address the issue at the core of contemporary Conservative politics; Britain's relationship with the European Union. Forthrightly they express the opinion that: "... contemporary Conservatism has not yet discovered how to reconcile the party's deep-rooted and popular tradition of defending the sovereign British Parliamentary state with active membership of the EU", adding: "By the mid-1990s fundamental issues of national sovereignty raised by European integration and unresolved since the 1950s could no longer be evaded; they produced almost unmanageable divisions inside Parliament, the government and the Cabinet, and threatened to overwhelm Major's disunited party". The European fault-line may yet manage to bring the "broad" church crashing down.

This is a book which those involved in the study and practice of Conservative politics should welcome, and it easily fulfils its aim to constitute a good general reader for non-specialists. More pertinently for the participant it offers an outsider's assessment of their party's recent performance, and discusses possible future directions — a key introduction for those wishing to understand the main themes shaping contemporary British Conservatism.
